Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/820,684	KITAGAWA, NOBUHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian R. Gordon	1743
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) Brian R. Gordon.	(3)	
(2) Richard Gallahger.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 June 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 112, secnond paragraph rejection of claim 1		
Claims discussed: 1 and 12		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	ne examiner will provide a record of the substance of	written summary of the substance
Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office		

Continuation Sneet (PTOL-413B)

Application No. 09/820,684

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In effort to expedite the allowance of the claims, the examiner placed a called to applicant on 5-24-04. The examiner informed applicant that claim 1 was primarily amended as suggested by the examiner in the final office action 2-24-04. However, the suggested amendment to clarify the "suitable operational position" was excluded by applicant and new broader independent claim (12) was added. The examiner invited applicant to make the previously proposed amendment to clarify the phrase and cancel new claim 12, which may be persued in a separate application, in order to allow the remaining claims. Mr. Gallahger indicated he would contact applicant with proposed solutions and contact the examiner with a decision. Due to the lack of a response, the examiner once again contacted Mr. Gallahger on 6-2-04 to see if a decision had been made. Mr Gallagher did not indicate a decision had been made and said perhaps applicant intend to pursue the new in the instant application. The examiner informed applicant that the amendment would not be entered and an advisory action would be issued. .